

Fall 12-15-1982

Senate Meeting, December 15, 1982

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, December 15, 1982" (1982). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 532.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/532>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

December 15, 1982

Volume XIV, No. 7

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of December 1, 1982

Resignation of Senator

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Memorial Statement*

Student Body President's Remarks

Program Reviews - College of Applied Science and Technology and Student
Academic Services - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (11.23.82.2)

Expanded Program Requests - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (11.23.82.1)

Deletion of Severely/Profoundly Handicapped Sequence in Special Education
(11.2.82.2)

Committee Appointments/Nominations

Student Election Code Revisions (11.22.82.1)

Proposal to Split Student Center/Auditorium Board into Separate Policy
and Programming Committees (11.9.82.1)

Committee Reports

Adjournment

*See appendix

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

December 15, 1982

Volume XIV, No. 7

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chairperson Tuttle in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Roll Call

Secretary Varner called the roll and announced that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of December 1, 1982

Mr. Miller noted two corrections on page 12 under Expanded Program Requests: fourth paragraph, last sentence, the word "additional" should be deleted so the sentence would read "...to cover 7 total FTE's." In paragraph 7, "7 FTE should read "3 FTE." On page 7, paragraph 2 under XIV-57, Mr. Ritt said the first sentence should read, "...whether teaching had a higher priority than research." On page 12, last paragraph, Mr. Friedhoff said he had also asked Dr. Jabker to explain the nature of the arguments in the Academic Planning Committee as well as the committee's vote on the expanded program requests. In the next to the last paragraph, page 11, Mr. Eimmermann said he had directed his question concerning the possible connection between program reviews and financial exigency to the administration and to Mr. Ritt in his role as chair of the Financial Exigency Committee. The minutes did not reflect Dr. Jabker's response to his question. He said he would ask it again at the appropriate time.

- XIV-70 On a motion by Mr. Schmaltz (seconded by Mr. Friedhoff), the minutes of the December meeting of the Senate were approved as corrected on a voice vote.

Resignation of Senator

- XIV-71 On a motion by Mr. Wright (seconded by Mr. Bedingfield), the resignation of Todd Weegar, a graduate student, was accepted with regret. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Mr. Tuttle explained that Mr. Weegar would be completing his graduate work at the end of the semester. The vacancy would be filled at the initiative of the Student Affairs Committee.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Tuttle announced that Kathy McClure, elected by the Senate to the search committee for the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology, had resigned because of an internship which would take her off campus during much of the second semester. The runner up in the election conducted November 17 was Lisa Bonner, a junior in clothing and textiles. Ms. Bonner would be Ms. McClure's replacement. Mr. Tuttle thanked President Watkins for the refreshments provided at this meeting.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Bruin said Greg Brooks, Student Association Vice President, was at the Senate meeting to speak on behalf of the Student Association.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins reported that Provost Boothe was recovering very well from surgery.

As noted at the last meeting, Mr. Watkins had heard a report on the evening news on December 1 that there was a \$200 million shortfall in state revenues, and the solution- mentioned at that time by the Governor included a tax increase, a speed up of revenue collection, and budget cuts. The speed up of utility revenue collections and budget cuts have now been officially announced. The Legislature gave the Governor authority to cut \$164 million from state appropriations. Higher education's share of the budget cut was \$20.2 million (about 2%). Higher education had not been "picked on." Mr. Watkins said he shared the feeling of chagrin that it was necessary to have to deal with such a situation.

The following is a chronology of what has occurred with regard to the budget cuts. Early in December the Governor received approval of "impound" funds to cover any revenue shortfalls. The word "recision" was not being used. The \$20.2 million cut for higher education was figured on 2% of the total general revenue budget. ISU's share was \$938,200. Before the Board of Regents meeting last week, all system heads (University of Illinois, Board of Governors, Board of Regents, and Southern Illinois University) met and agreed to recommend to their respective boards that in view of the fact of impoundment and in view of the possibility of a second impoundment, it would be the better part of wisdom to postpone the 3% salary increase until April 1. Another assessment of the state's financial situation would be made at that time. The Needs and Priorities Committee was giving thought to what would happen if there were a second impoundment. A resolution to review the situation in March was passed by the Board of Regents at its December 9 meeting. When cuts have to be made half way through the fiscal year, there is less flexibility. The Needs and Priorities Committee began work last Friday and met again this past Monday and had recommended what would be done during "Jaws I." The period being referred to as "Jaws II" would take more deliberation.

It was fortunate that the University has people who have managed dollars very well. Room and board fees would not be increased next year. Bond revenue money had been well managed. There were two options under consideration to cope with the problems. Under the first option, the use of general revenue funds for bond revenue utilities would be phased out immediately. This would account for \$466,000. Some projects in residence halls would have to be deferred. The amount realized from deferring until April 1 the 3% salary increase would be \$340,000. Equipment funds totaling \$112,000, and awards and grants totaling \$20,000, would be added to the above figures for a total of \$938,000. A total of \$591,000 would be saved if the 3% increase in salaries were not awarded at all. Under the second option, the following monies would be impounded: \$147,000 from the Vice President for Business and Finance, \$180,000 from the Provost's area, \$125,000 in equipment funds, and \$20,000 from awards and grants.

In the President's meeting with the college deans, they said summer session would be protected. Programs and people would be pretty well protected. Not filling some vacant positions immediately would save some money. If salary increases were granted April 1, they would have to be annualized beginning July 1, 1983. At this time it is not known if that would be funded.

It would depend, in part, on the rate of unemployment and tax collections during the next few months. Nobody, including professional economic predictors, knew what would happen. The University would be conscientiously seeking solutions. It was fortunate to have the flexibility we have.

Mr. Strand reported that the Needs and Priorities Committee had frozen all equipment purchases as of Friday, December 10. Summer session decisions at Northern Illinois University should not be associated with actions being taken at ISU. Northern consciously cut the summer program there because of a large freshman class. Concerning rumors about the last Board of Regents meeting, he pointed out that the location was changed to accommodate travel schedules. It was a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. The January meeting, originally scheduled for Chicago, had been cancelled because of possible weather problems; a February 17 meeting had been scheduled at Sangamon State.

Mr. Friedhoff, in referring to the President's December 10 message to the university community, said some faculty misunderstood what was meant by system heads and thought they were the chairpersons of governing boards. Mr. Watkins said they are the executives of each system.

Mr. Ritt said it would be useful to understand that it was still an option of the Board of Regents to restore any or all of the 3% raise. Mr. Watkins said he did not know whether it could legally be done before April 1.

Mr. Schmaltz said one of the rumors going around campus was that the Board of Governors schools, with union contracts, would get the 3% raise. Mr. Watkins again noted that all system heads agreed to make the recommendation to their respective boards that it be delayed. He did not know what the Board of Governors would do. The situation there was complicated by a union contract. Mr. Ritt responded that under that same contract people could be dismissed without notice.

Mr. Eimermann asked whether people would be dismissed under option II. President Watkins said that vacancies would be filled slower. The decisions would be made by the colleges. In response to another question by Mr. Eimermann, Mr. Watkins said that both options would be sent to the Board of Regents at their request. The decisions were up to the three institutions in the Regency system. They have to be prepared for the situation that may come in April. Mr. Eimermann wondered whether there would be more need for equipment for next year if equipment purchases were frozen this year. President Watkins said that would be the case.

Mr. Friedhoff felt more should be done outside the university to get better press. There should be an effort to get this dilemma in front of the public. If the university appears to be able to comply with the impounding, the implication to the public is that there is that much available to give up, that the university is not hurting from this situation. Mr. Watkins responded that such situations were not always considered newsworthy by the area media. His intention was to step up modes of communication internally and keep the campus community informed.

Ms. Crafts noted that JUAC members were supportive of the job done by the three presidents in clearly stating the problems caused by the budget reductions. Mr. Tuttle added that JUAC had communicated to the Board the fact that the consequences of budget reductions would have a devastating

effect on the campus. The three presidents and Dr. Matsler had communicated the same message. Mr. Watkins said Ms. Crafts had done a good job as chair of JUAC.

Mr. Watkins said he was disappointed in these developments but ISU was in better shape than many others he had read about in the Chronicle of Higher Education. There was a world wide recession. Work must be done in the state to reassert the priority of higher education.

Mr. Tuttle thanked Mr. Watkins for providing the chronology and explanation which would help dispel some rumors. A steady distribution of information would be appreciated.

Mr. Strand, in his remarks, explained the presence of the "wading pool" on the plaza between the Student Center and the library. The university had received \$500,000 in emergency funding from the state to begin the necessary repairs. The area in question was over the electrical system for the library. Once the pending litigation was settled, the plaza would be replaced and the library roof repaired.

Mr. Gamsky reported that a recent Forum speaker on WJBC had commented on an alleged rape in a Bone Student Center restroom and that the administration was covering up that incident. Mr. Gamsky said there was no evidence to support the story, and a local investigation found no substantiation of any acts so reported. WJBC did report on the 6:30 and 8:30 a.m. news a retraction. The problem was that probably 90% of those who had heard the initial story did not hear the retraction. The Forum speaker would not give the source of the story.

Mr. Gamsky distributed to the members of the Senate coupons for free hamburgers, compliments of Mr. Ted Woods, manager of the Student Center Bookstore.

Memorial Statement*

Mr. Tuttle called on Mr. McCracken who read a memorial statement for Professor Jack Ward. Mr. Tuttle asked the Senate to observe a minute of silence in memory of Professor Ward. (The memorial statement is appended to these minutes.)

Student Body President's Remarks

In the absence of Mr. Kroner, Mr. Greg Brooks, Student Association Vice President, was present to make remarks. Mr. Brooks said the Student Association was conducting its annual Christmas tree drive. Trees were collected from students when they left for vacation and distributed to needy families in the community.

ACTION ITEMS:

Program Reviews - University Analysis and Recommendations - ISU 1983-1988 Academic Plan (11.23.82.2)

- XIV-72 Mr. Eggan, Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson, moved that the Senate recommend Section IV, Program Reviews, for inclusion in the Academic Plan (seconded by Mr. McCracken).

Mr. Eggan said the statements were the result of a good deal of thought and negotiations. If the recommended changes called for in some reviews were not implemented, programs could be deleted. He commended the Provost's Office for the

work done on this section. The Academic Affairs Committee was recommending inclusion rather than approval of this section which contained the program review for the College of Applied Science and Technology and Student Academic Services. The committee had not analyzed this section to the extent as Sections I, II, and III. The Academic Affairs Committee recommended that discussion center on the mission of the college and analysis and recommendation of program reviews rather than the summaries from departments.

Mr. Eimermann asked what part of the program review documents would be considered relevant in terms of financial exigency. He addressed his question to Mr. Ritt, by virtue of his role as chair of the Financial Exigency Committee, and to the Administration. Mr. Ritt said that using documents such as the Academic Plan and the Needs and Priorities Committee statement which have been publicly discussed and approved by the President would provide the criteria for deciding which areas would be subject to budget cuts. In his opinion the Needs and Priorities document and the section of the Academic Plan on planning priorities would be relevant, not the program reviews. In his mind college statements should not be the primary consideration for setting priorities. Mr. Watkins said he agreed with Mr. Ritt, and if the day when we have to decide what survives and what does not, qualitative decisions would have to be made. The program reviews are done to help departments improve themselves. These program reviews clearly indicate some dissatisfaction in some areas and how they should improve. Program reviews would be used as a secondary source, if at all, in a time of financial exigency.

Mr. Eimermann then asked for clarification of the role of the Senate in reviewing this section of the Academic Plan. Mr. Watkins responded that the Senate should decide if this document represents a serious effort in program review. The Senate should applaud a forthright review and resent a whitewash. The Senate should criticize the process where reviews are not up to snuff.

Mr. Schmaltz asked what the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee, to include, implied? Did it mean they did not care? He felt there was a difference between "include" and "approve." He was under the impression that the Senate usually approved the document.

Mr. Watkins viewed Senate action as a recommendation to send the document forward to the Board of Regents. Mr. Tuttle said the Senate's judgement to include implied that it was worthy of sending on. Mr. Reitan said the Senate needed to insist on good committee work. How carefully had the Academic Affairs Committee reviewed the document. What were some of the concerns? Mr. Egan said the Academic Affairs Committee received this section at the same time as the rest of the Senate. The Committee did not review it program by program. A subcommittee had been appointed to review it. He felt parts had not been read by all the members of the Academic Affairs Committee. He did not know how to respond to some questions asked at the last meeting. Negotiations had taken place between the Associate Provost and the College of Applied Science and Technology and the Student Academic Services area. The committee was sorry it did not have enough time for a thorough review. He hoped the program review from the College of Arts and Sciences would come to Academic Affairs next spring in time to allow a thorough review. For the above reasons, the committee did not recommend approval but had moved it be included.

Mr. Plummer noted that if program reviews get any better, faculty would not have time to teach at all. Much time is being consumed by the process. Each department produces a lengthy review. Four of the most productive scholars in the History Department, for example, were involved. The

Xeroxing bill would be high without the budget to cover the cost. As many as 34,000 pages could be involved and, when completed, the Board of Regents would still just be looking at student/faculty ratios.

Mr. Watkins responded that every unit in the institution had to be reviewed as required by the Board of Higher Education.

Mr. Woodson wanted to know how many Senators had read the entire program review section. He asked for a straw vote. He said it was difficult to vote on this section if only a minority had read it.

The motion (72) passed on a voice vote with several abstentions noted.

Expanded Program Requests - 1983-1988 Academic Plan (11.23.82.1) - Institute for Computer Information Systems Development, High Technology System--Department of Industrial Technology, and Improvement of Student Academic Services.

XIV-73 Mr. Eggan, Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson, with the following three additions, moved approval of the expanded program requests, as submitted for inclusion as Section III of the Academic Plan: (1) Page 2, paragraph 3, line one, insert "generally" after "will" so it reads, "The faculty lines in the Institute will generally be filled by applied computer science faculty..." (2) Page 3, paragraph 4, add at the end: "Students may earn academic credit through participation in the Institute. The amount of credit and the particular courses in the various departments through which this credit will be generated will vary depending on the project. Specific details will be a part of each project staffing plan. (3) Page 2, paragraph 1, insert "the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and Public Services," into the Steering Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. Eggan explained that the changes suggested were a result of discussion in the Academic Affairs Committee and negotiations made with the Applied Computer Science Department and the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology for the Institute for Computer Information Systems Development. The Academic Planning Committee had been interested in the program being more university wide. This perspective was accomplished with the addition of three more faculty lines and the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and Public Services. The credit hour production source was also added to support this perspective. About the High Technology System, there was not a great deal of discussion in the Academic Affairs Committee. The Academic Planning Committee questioned whether it should be funded because of a lack of expertise in the department. Documentation had been provided to answer that concern. A budget sheet had been distributed to the Senate for the expanded program request for the Improvement of Student Academic Services. It included \$89,150 to replace federal funds in the Special Services area and to improve learning centers. Dr. Michael Powers, Applied Computer Services Chairperson, had formulated the credit hour production that would take place in different departments. ⁴For the steering committee, the Academic Affairs Committee had wanted to replace the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology with the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and Public Service. Because of the way in which the Institute was attached to the College of Applied Science and Technology, it was necessary for the Dean of that college to be a member of the steering committee. Therefore, the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and Public Services had been added to the steering committee. Mr. Eggan said another member of the Academic Affairs Committee wished to make some comments.

Mr. Taylor expressed the opinion that someone from the business information system program should be a member of the steering committee. It would provide an opportunity for students and faculty in this program to interface with the business community to design and implement actual systems. It would give students a look at potential employers and vice versa. The original proposal came to the Academic Planning Committee strictly for Applied Computer Sciences. The Academic Planning Committee was concerned about the interdisciplinary nature. The Accounting Department offers the most computer courses outside Applied Computer Sciences. Applied Computer Sciences generated 10,430 credit hours; Accounting generated 5,070 hours. Accounting would like to have involvement in the program and make it more interdisciplinary. Other colleges and departments in the university were going to become more involved in computer application and would be interested to participate too. The chain of command for the proposed Institute was through Applied Computer Sciences, but this program should not be just for Applied Computer Science and should be available to the entire university. He would like to see the reference to Applied Computer Science faculty (page 2) dropped. The program should be available for all competent faculty. The Dean of the College of Business and the Chair of the Accounting Department should be added to the steering committee. He would have nothing against having all colleges represented.

Mr. Mohr asked Dr. Jabker a series of questions. Did the Academic Planning Committee depart from the past practice to review and recommend programs?--Yes. Did one subcommittee review the expanded program requests?--Yes. Did the subcommittee recommend against a College of Business expanded program request, and did the committee of the whole agree with the negative recommendation, and was the decision based not on the merits of the proposal but on the feeling that it was unseemly to ask for that much new money in time of financial austerity?--No. Was the subcommittee composed of two people from Arts and Sciences and one from Applied Science and Technology?--Yes. Did the subcommittee recommend against the Student Academic Services Expanded Program Request and the High Technology System?--Correct. Why did the committee of the whole agree in one instance and overrule the subcommittee in the other two?--After the subcommittee recommendations, changes were made in two proposals. The committee of the whole felt the changes made were satisfactory and voted for the proposals.

Mr. Eggan said the Academic Planning Committee had many questions answered by the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology, and Dr. Carmen Richardson, Director of Student Academic Services. There were two or three meetings where these proposals were discussed. The College of Business proposal was also discussed, and the Dean of the College of Business had been there to answer questions. He had the opportunity to persuade the committee. It had not been persuaded.

Mr. Mohr wanted it known that he had been asked to raise these questions by members of the subcommittee, not someone in the College of Business.

Mr. Woodson asked if the two time speaking rule was in effect for this debate. Mr. Tuttle said it was.

Mr. Woodson asked Mr. Eggan if he was moving approval of the 16-page summaries provided to the Senate or the 145-page full document. Mr. Eggan said he had not seen the 145-page document. He did not know whether other members of the Academic Planning Committee had seen the entire document. Mr. Jabker

said the members of the subcommittee had received the complete document. Other members of the Academic Planning Committee had had access to the full document. The subcommittee favored one of the proposals and was against three. Answering another of Mr. Woodson's questions, Dr. Jabker said no minutes were kept of the Academic Planning Committee meetings. Mr. Woodson then asked whether it would be possible, in view of the fact that virtually no one at the table had read the full document, to make minutes available in the future. If the Senate did not have some basis for focusing on this issue, the Senate could not make a decision but only just pass it on through. There is a legislative responsibility to determine the validity of what is done by the Senate. Knowledge of the content of the document was necessary. Fiscal determination could not be made on the basis of a summary. The Academic Planning Committee had made a determination in terms of millions of dollars. What would happen if these programs were approved and a state of financial exigency arrived? Would those areas have priority? Where do NEPR's fit into needs and priorities?

Mr. Eggan responded that the Academic Affairs Committee did obtain assurances that the final draft would be run past the committee so it could determine whether it lived up to the summary. The structure of the final proposal should be based on the approved summaries. The Senate was approving summaries with the view to the final document.

Mr. Ritt said, regarding Mr. Woodson's concerns, if these funds were approved by the Board of Higher Education for the specific purpose of a NEPR, the Needs and Priorities Committee would have no active role. If programs were implemented and reductions became necessary, the programs would be subject to the same scrutiny as any other program. Mr. Strand concurred. New programs would undergo the same scrutiny. At this point in time, the Board of Higher Education staff was not funding NEPR's or Special Analytical Studies, there was a moratorium. Mr. Strand further explained that the Needs and Priorities Committee would prioritize the expanded program requests approved by the Senate, and rank them for the President.

Mr. Ritt said the prioritization of the expanded program requests would not establish priority vis-a-vis other programs.

In response to one of Mr. Woodson's earlier questions, Dr. Jabker said minutes could be kept for the Academic Planning Committee meetings in the future. It was a reasonable request.

Mr. Friedhoff commented that Mr. Strand's earlier statement indicated there was not much likelihood for funding. Given the fact that these documents do go into competition with requests from other universities, they should be of high quality. He had read one of the complete expanded program proposals, Student Academic Services, and had some observations. There was a lack of data to support many of the statements concerning, for example, the success of freshman and non traditional students during the first year, and discussion about the prediction of who will be probationary students. There seemed to be concern about enrollment, yet the university was having no problem with that. He did not oppose the program but felt there should be more supporting evidence.

Mr. Eimermann noted that the Board of Regents was pessimistic about 1983 funding. He understood the rationale that we needed new programs. He was concerned, based on the past, that programs would be partially funded and the rest would have to come from internal reallocation. That would create tremendous

problems. A Board staff member agreed with that. Mr. Eimermann was bothered that the Senate was not prioritizing the proposals.

- XIV-74 Mr. Eimermann moved that the Senate's decision to approve these new and expanded programs is contingent upon their receiving the requested financial support through appropriations for new programs--and not through reallocation. Mr. Brickell seconded the motion.

Mr. Ritt said it was his understanding that the actual NEPR was not sent out without specific approval of the Senate. He asked whether it would be brought back to the Senate after the plan was approved. Mr. Watkins responded that this was appropriate for new programs but not for expanded programs. Concerning Mr. Eimermann's motion he said what we request is money--whatever is available. Each of these programs would mean dollars and make the needs of the university known. If the university were to receive \$150,000 of the \$300,000 requested, only that much would be spent. If 50% were received, it would be incumbent upon us to make the most appropriate expenditure.

Mr. Ritt said the requests should have come to the Budget Committee since there are financial implications.

Mr. Eggan said the university was asking for new money and would take whatever new money might be given for the expanded programs. He did not understand the need for reallocation in this context. The University was requesting full funding but would take any amount approved. Mr. Eimermann clarified his concern that if only half of the funding was received, he did not want to see the whole Institute. Mr. Eimermann asked the chair for a recess so a better worded amendment could be presented.

- (74) Following a 10-minute recess at 9:47, the following wording was presented:
The Senate's decision to approve the expanded program request is contingent upon the understanding that if less than the requested amount is granted for this purpose the programs will be authorized to be implemented at a reduced level appropriate to the partial funding. Mr. Brickell, who seconded the original amendment, agreed to the new wording.

- XIV-75 Mr. Wright moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Bedingfield). The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote with some nay votes and some abstentions.

On a roll call vote the amendment failed 11:14:8.

- XIV-76 Mr. Taylor moved to amend the first full paragraph on page 2 with the following substitute paragraph: The major activities of the Institute will be governed by a Steering Committee headed by a chairperson selected annually by the Steering Committee from its own ranks. The members will be the chairperson of the Department of Applied Computer Science, the chairperson of the Department of Accounting, the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and Public Service, the Associate Provost and Dean of Instruction, and two client representatives external to ISU who will be appointed for two-year staggered terms by the permanent members. The motion was seconded by Ms. Varner.

Mr. Taylor said this would address the representation from other colleges. He was not opposed to other colleges being represented on the committee.

Mr. Hobbs had mixed feelings about extending membership to just one other college. The Associate Provost would give it a wider perspective. Mr. Eggan said a majority of the Academic Affairs Committee members felt it was inappropriate to single out another college or department. It was an Applied Computer Science program, generated by that department. In the early stages it should be attached to that department. When the program grew and expanded there might be such changes. The Dean of Continuing Education and the Associate Provost would see to it that no one was excluded.

Dr. Anita Webb-Lupo, Acting Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology, was invited to the table to respond to Mr. Taylor's amendment. Dr. Webb-Lupo made the following points: (1) The College of Applied Science and Technology and the Department of Applied Computer Science recognized there were computer experts in other areas around campus. (2) Based on Academic Planning Priorities, each college has unique objectives. On page 51 of the catalog it says, "the purpose of the Applied Computer Science program is to provide training in the application of computer and systems techniques to real world problems." No other unit was charged with the development of computer information systems. Applied Computer Science is the one unit responsible for the development of information systems. The Institute should be based in that unit. It was part of the mission of the department of Applied Computer Science. For wise management of resources, that chairperson must be part of the steering committee. The Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology was responsible for decisions made regarding the use of resources for the entire college. To practice efficient resource allocation, the Dean had to be on the steering committee. There was no rationale for just one other college to be a member. If one other college was to be included, all should be included.

Ms. Landre asked why the Dean of the College of Continuing Education was included. Dr. Jabker responded that the Dean represented all outside people. Ms. Landre said the chair of the Department of Accounting might not always be a computer expert.

Mr. Taylor said that the Business Information System was housed in Accounting. Applied Computer Science concentrated on programming and analysis. Accounting emphasized application.

XIV-77 Mr. Wright moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Bedingfield). The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote.

The Taylor amendment failed on a voice vote.

Mr. Reitan asked if the Institute for Computer Information Systems Development was a new program. Dr. Jabker said the program had so far been operated on a shoestring basis. The program looked new, but the activities with which it would be concerned were not new. Mr. Reitan asked how many other programs not previously funded were now lying in the dust bin and could perhaps be of greater priority than those now proposed. Dr. Jabker said none were in the waiting line. The Academic Planning Committee dealt with those they thought were worthy of funding at this time. The funding was requested for FY-1985.

Mr. Petrossian felt the Institute was an innovative program and a credit to the University. Students needed this program. He was impressed with the look to the future.

Mr. Brickell said he was not satisfied with the distinction being made

between new and expanded programs. The Industrial Technology proposal and the Student Academic Services program were clearly expansions of existing programs. Does the Institute exist? Dr. Jabker said that technically it does not, but the activities do exist. Written as an expanded program request did not mean it had a better chance of funding.

- XIV-78 Ms. Landre moved to amend the expanded program request for the Institute for Computer Information Systems Development, page 2, third full paragraph, by deleting "generally" and "applied computer science." The sentence would read: The faculty lines in the Institute will be filled by faculty members who are systems and technical specialists... The motion was seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Ms. Landre pointed out that similar programs at other schools used specialists from the entire university. This program at ISU should not be confined to just Applied Computer Science faculty. The practice at other schools had contributed to the computer literacy of the entire campus.

- XIV-79 Mr. Wright moved the previous question (seconded by Ms. Pager). The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote.

On a roll call vote, Ms. Landre's amendment passed 16:10:7.

Mr. Woodson noted that the Student Academic Services proposal included no national studies in support of some of the rationale. Would it strengthen the proposal to include them? He also questioned the reference to raising ACT scores as not having an affect on retention. He also asked what the fallback position would be for the Special Services program if this proposal were not approved.

Dr. Carmen Richardson, Director of Student Academic Services, was invited to the table to respond. She said she was not sure the national studies would be that helpful. There was a concern about the length of the report. She pointed out that the proposal had said that raising the ACT would not solve the retention problem. There were other than academic reasons for persons with an ACT over 20 going on probation. If federal funding for the Special Services Program was lost and no general revenue funds were forthcoming, a reduction in services to 200-220 freshman would occur. In the North Central Evaluation, it had been pointed out that in attempting to raise academic standards, the university should be careful that these attempts did not result in a decrease of minority students. There had been a decrease of Black students at ISU. The retention rate of those students in the Special Services Program had been very high. Funding from federal sources for the fourth year had been applied for. Funding was tenuous.

Mr. McCracken wondered if it would be possible to change the makeup of the steering committee for the Institute at a later date. Mr. Eggan responded, that as the program grew and changed, representation on the steering committee of user application faculty might be involved.

Mr. Mohr said the University needs to make its needs known by means of some vehicle. The College of Business is the largest college in the university and the most cost effective--most underfunded. The college did not want to improve itself at the expense of other areas of the University, yet he regretted that the Academic Planning Committee did not see fit to recognize the extremity of the situation and to recommend the improved program request from the

College of Business.

- (7-80 Mr. Eggan moved the previous question (seconded by Mr. Brickell). The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote.
- XIV-81 Mr. Eimermann moved to divide the question (seconded by Mr. Allen). On a roll call vote the motion to divide the question failed 11:22.
- (73) On a roll call vote, Section III, as amended, was approved 32:0:1.
- Dr. Jabker thanked the Senate for its work on the Academic Plan.

Deletion of Severely/Profoundly Handicapped Sequence in Special Education (11.2.82.2)

- XIV-82 Mr. Eggan moved approval of the deletion of the Severely/Profoundly Handicapped Sequence in Special Education (seconded by Ms. Landre).
- Mr. Bowen explained that the sequence was developed with the understanding there would be state certification in the area. This did not happen, so there was no need for the sequence. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Committee Appointments/Nominations

- XIV-83 Mr. Brickell, Rules Committee Chairperson, moved approval of the Provost's appointments to the Council for Teacher Education (seconded by Mr. Eimermann).

For three-year appointments to end December 31, 1985: Dr. Ronald Budig, Industrial Technology; Dr. John Rich, Business Education and Administrative Services; Dr. David Tucker, Specialized Educational Development; Dr. Benjamin Tucker, Mathematics.

For two-year appointments to end December 31, 1984: Mr. Scott Eatherly, English; Dr. George Foeller, Music.

For one-year term, as the Senate representative: Dr. Joe Townsend, Agriculture.

Mr. Brickell explained that there currently was a large proportion of terms which expired in the same year. The proposed staggered terms would correct this situation. Mr. Eggan asked why the Senate appointment came from the Dean of the College of Education. Was this not contrary to Senate policy? Mr. Tuttle said the Rules Committee should look into this practice before the appointments were made next year (this position was for a one-year term).

The motion passed on a voice vote.

- XIV-84 Mr. Brickell moved approval of the following nominations for the SCERB Hearing Panel: Catherine Batsche, Home Economics and Katherine Shaw, Milner Library, for terms ending in August 1983; Patricia Chesebro, Psychology, for a term ending in August 1984. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bruin.

Mr. Brickell said the names had been recommended to the Rules Committee by Dr. Dorothy Carrington, Affirmative Action Officer. All nominees were willing to serve in this capacity and the names would be forwarded to President Watkins for his appointment. The motion passed on a voice vote.

XIV-85 Mr. Brickell moved approval of the following appointments (seconded by Mr. Wright):

Student Center/Auditorium Board (effective immediately)

Martin McKenzie

William Helgren

Deb Lewis

Kathy Hanna

Lori Ringhouse

Kathy Seaton (effective December 18)

Sherry Young (effective December 18)

Karen Herbst (effective January 15)

Forum (effective immediately)

Royal Roth

Mr. Schmaltz asked if all students were in good academic standing and not on disciplinary probation. Mr. Brickell said he had been assured of that by Mr. Mike Schermer, Director of the Student Life and Programs Office. The motion passed on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

Student Election Code Revisions (11.22.82.1)

Mr. Brickell introduced this item. He said there was lack of agreement on the Rules Committee so the proposed changes were being brought to the Senate with no recommendation from the Rules Committee. Mr. Brickell asked Mr. Bruin to explain the rationale behind the proposed changes.

Mr. Bruin said the effect would be to remove party affiliation from the ballot for Student Association and Association of Residence Halls elections. This was already the case for students running for the Senate. Both of the other groups had ratified the proposed change. The Senate Bylaws already had this provision which covered students running for the Senate. The proposed wording for the revision was as follows: Each candidate's legal name should appear on the petition precisely as it will appear on the ballot. A candidate shall have only his/her major(s) placed on the ballot beside his/her name. All other designations, including initials, abbreviations, and party affiliated names, initials or insigna are prohibited from appearing on the ballot.

XIV-86 Mr. Bedingfield moved that the Senate take emergency action on this item at this meeting (seconded by Mr. Wright). Mr. Tuttle said that would not be possible if there was a single objection. Mr. Allen objected. (There was no formal vote on the motion.)

Ms. Orchowski, Student Regents, explained that if it was not passed tonight the February election would have to be delayed and the Senate would need to waive one of its own bylaws.

Mr. Schmaltz asked if the Student Affairs Committee had reviewed the proposed changes. Ms. Pager, Chairperson, said the committee had not studied the document.

XIV-87 Mr. Schmaltz moved that the proposed changes be sent to the Student Affairs

Committee for a recommendation when this item returns for action (seconded by Mr. Friedhoff). The motion passed on a voice vote with some nay votes and some abstentions.

Proposal to Split Student Center/Auditorium Board in Separate Policy and Programming Committees (11.9.82.1)

Mr. Brickell, Rules Committee Chairperson, said the Rules Committee did support the proposal to split the single Student Center/Auditorium Board into separate policy and programming committees but did not support the composition of the proposed new committees.

Ms. Pager asked Ms. Bryn Dunning, current Student Center/Auditorium Board Chairperson, to the table for the discussion.

Mr. Wright asked if there was a provision for the Student Center Board to review the budget of the Center. He saw this as a function of the policy committee. There should be student input in the budget process. Mr. Gamsky noted that care should be taken to avoid many committees doing the same thing. There is currently extensive review of the budget by students on the Fee Committee.

Mr. Schmaltz asked how many faculty currently serve on the Student Center/Auditorium Board. Ms. Dunning said there were three, one from Fine Arts. Mr. Egan asked if the work was currently being done by one committee. What would be the relationship between the two committees? How would they inter-relate? Ms. Dunning said there would be two separate committees, they would not be related. The policy committee would be an advisory committee. Mr. Allen commented that there were currently two subcommittees of the Student Center/Auditorium Board. Many people think that the policy subcommittee sets policies on programming. That is not the function. It is advisory to the Director.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs. Mr. Egan, Chairperson, said the committee would be setting a meeting time for second semester. They would be working on the writing proposal.

Administrative Affairs. Ms. Crafts, Chairperson, said there were several items on the committee's agenda. Nothing was planned as an information item on January 12.

Budget Committee. No report.

Executive Committee. Mr. Bruin said the next meeting would be January 5, 1983, at 8:15 a.m. in Hovey 308.

Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Schmaltz, Chairperson, said the committee had met December 3. They discussed the Academic Freedom Committee Policies and Procedures. In attendance were the current chairperson and two former AFC chairpersons. The President and the Provost, who both had concerns about the document, would be asked to meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee and the past and present AFC chairpersons. The second item discussed December 3 was the matter of temporary faculty practice submitted by Mr. Rosenbaum.

The committee had no recommendation or proposal at this time. It was suggested that Mr. Rosenbaum discuss this topic with Dr. Gary Davis, Assistant Provost, and work on a feasible plan.

Joint University Advisory Committee. Ms. Crafts read part of the JUAC statement presented to the Board of Regents at the December 9 meeting:

JUAC feels that the impact of projected budgetary cuts for higher education, and in particular, for Regency System institutions, should be clearly recognized. Cuts in the budget will cause substantial negative effects upon the primary mission of the institutions, that mission being the provision of quality education for students. The cuts will thwart the development of human resources which elected officials from all parties have emphasized as the basis for long term recovery within the state. The cuts also will cause further deterioration of faculty and staff morale.

Ms. Crafts said if there were concerns that members of the Senate would suggest JUAC propose for the Spring Retreat with the Board of Regents and the Board staff, she would appreciate receiving them. She also reported that all JUAC members had received a note of thanks from Frank Matsler for support of his suggestion that a tax increase be sought and commending them for the work done this past year. Dr. Tuttle will represent ISU on the planning committee for the Spring Retreat.

Mr. Eimermann added that Dr. Matsler and the three university presidents had spoken strongly in support of increased funding for the Regency System.

Rules Committee. No report.

Student Affairs. No report.

XIV-88 On a motion by Mr. Schmaltz (seconded by Mr. Wright) the meeting was adjourned at 11:41 p.m. The motion carried.

For the Academic Senate,

Iris Varner, Secretary

IV:pch

Date: 12/15/82

Volume No: XIV

No. 7

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE			Abstain
		Motion # 73	Motion # 74	Motion # 78	Motion # 81	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N	
Allen	P	Y	Y	Y	Y				70	x		
Andrejek	A								71	x		
Bedingfield	P	Y	abstain	N	N				72	x		
Boothe	EX.								73	32	0	1
Bowen	P	Y	Y	Y	N				74	11	14	8
Brickell	P	Y	Y	Y	N				75	x		
Bruin	P	Y	abstain	Y	Y				76		x	
Campbell	EX								77	x		
Corra	EX								78	16	10	7
Crafts	P	Y	N	N	N				79	x		
Eggan	P	Y	N	abstain	N				80	x		
Eimermann	P	abstain	Y	Y	Y				81	11	22	
Frahm	P	*	*	*	*				82	x		
Friedhoff	P	Y	Y	abstain	Y				83	x		
Gamsky	P	Y	abstain	abstain	Y				84	x		
Goodwin	P	Y	Y	N	N				85	x		
Gowdy	P	Y	N	Y	Y				86		x	
Hobbs	P	Y	abstain	Y	N				87	x		
Houghton	A								88	x		
Korchak	EX											
Kroner	A											
Landre	P	Y	N	Y	N							
Livesay	P	*	*	*	*							
McCracken	P	Y	abstain	Y	N							
Miller	P	Y	N	N	N							
Mohr	P	Y	Y	abstain	N							
Pager	P	Y	N	Y	N							
Petrossian	P	Y	N	N	N							
Plummer	P	Y	N	abstain	N							
Pontius	P	Y	N	N	N							
Pritner	P	Y	Y	Y	N							
Reitan	P	Y	N	N	N							
Ritt	P	Y	abstain	Y	Y							
Romani	EX											
Rosenbaum	P	Y	Y	Y	N							
Santiago	EX											
Schmaltz	P	Y	abstain	N	Y							
Sickel	EX.											
Slan	EX											
Strand	P	Y	N	Y	Y							
Taylor	P	Y	N	Y	Y							
Tuttle	P	Y	abstain	abstain	N							
Varner	P	Y	N	Y	N							
Voy	EX											
Waites	EX											
Watkins	P	Y	Y	N	N							
Weegar	A											
White	A											
Woodson	P	Y	Y	abstain	Y							
Wright	P	Y	N	N	N							

*Left before vote was taken.

MEMORIAL STATEMENT

On December 5, 1982, the Department of Biological Sciences lost a colleague and a friend when Dr. Jack Ward died at the age of 47 of a heart attack. The death of such a vibrant, energetic colleague leaves a considerable hole in department programs and activities. Jack Ward was a premier teacher who, by his enthusiastic teaching style, attracted large numbers of students to his Introduction to Biological Science and Animal Behaviour courses. His energy and drive carried over into research and the direction of graduate students. At the time of his death he had nine graduate students working with him in the study of behavior. His main research interest has been fish behavior with particular emphasis on cichlid species that are of economic importance in Sri Lanka. For this work he received two grants from the National Science Foundation and had collaborated with the Fisheries department in Sri Lanka.

Jack Ward's contributions to the University beyond those in teaching and research are numerous. His experience and reasoned approach to major issues will be missed. As a scholar, teacher, and colleague Jack Ward has touched the lives of many students and faculty at this University and it is with regret that we acknowledge his death.